

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13, and 15-21 are pending, in which claims 3, 5, 12, and 14 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and no claims are withdrawn from consideration, currently amended, or newly presented. No new matter is introduced.

As a preliminary matter, the Final Office Action mailed November 24, 2009 states (page 14) that “Applicant’s amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection” and therefore the action is made final. However, the amendment placed into independent claims 1 and 10 a limitation from independent claims 4 and 13, previously rejected. The amendment added no new limitations. Therefore, the amendment did not necessitate the new ground of rejection, and the finality of the Office Action is premature. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action.

The Final Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13, and 15-21 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on *Pruthi* (US 2002/010911) in view of *Bahadiroglu* (US 2002/0186660), *Ennis, Jr. et al.* (US 5,867,483), and *Hilliker* (US 2002/0100422).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13, and 15-21, as none of *Pruthi*, *Bahadiroglu*, *Ennis*, or *Hilliker*, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests “upon selection of the marking, a sequence of messages which corresponds to the specific point of the selected marking is read in from the storage device,” as is positively recited in each of independent claims 1, 4, 10, and 13. The Office Action states that *Pruthi* discloses displaying a sequence of messages in FIG. 17 (a first region), a selector determining a first characteristic feature of the messages and displaying a course of that feature in FIG. 20 (a second region), and storing an additional item of information for the messages. The Office Action admits (pages 4-5) that the combination of *Pruthi* and *Bahadiroglu* fails to teach or suggest “the sequence of

messages read in by the selector is dependent upon a selection with which a specific point of the course of the first characteristic feature selected is selectable in the second region, selectable marking, and upon selection of the marking, a sequence of messages which corresponds to the specific point of the selected marking is read in from the storage device.”

Referring to column 15, lines 7-14 and FIG. 3 of *Ennis*, the Office Action (page 5) asserts that *Ennis* discloses a sequence of messages read in by a selector is dependent upon a selection of a selectable marking in the course of the first characteristic feature. The Office Action contends that it would have been obvious “to incorporate the sequence of messages read in by the selector is dependent upon a selection with which a specific point of the course of the first characteristic feature selected is selectable in the second region, selectable marking, and upon selection of the marking, a sequence of messages which corresponds to the specific point of the selected marking is read in from the storage device.” *Ennis*, however, selects, based on a characteristic feature, a portion of data displayed in a first area to display in a second area in the same way that *Pruthi* displays a portion of data separately. There is no teaching or suggestion to then select a marking on the second display area based on an additional feature to read in another sequence of messages that corresponds to the marking. The only teaching that *Ennis* arguably adds to the disclosure of *Pruthi* is the selection of a marking.

The Office Action relies on *Hilliker* for the selector automatically producing the markings. *Hilliker*’s markings are automatically produced, but they are not on a second display area that displays a course of a first characteristic feature of messages displayed in a first display area, nor are the markings selectable to read in a second sequence of messages based on a second feature. The values of all of the markings in *Hilliker* are displayed in a table, and the table does not represent a sequence of messages according to a second feature. Accordingly, none of

Pruthi, Bahadiroglu, Ennis, or Hilliker, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests upon selection of the marking based on a second item of information, another sequence of messages which corresponds to the selected marking is read in from the storage device, and the obviousness rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 6-11, 13, and 15-21 cannot be sustained.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at (703) 519-9952 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 504213 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C.

January 14, 2010
Date

/Phouphanomketh Ditthavong/
Phouphanomketh Ditthavong
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44658

Anita Pellman Gross
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 63325

918 Prince Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Tel. (703) 519-9952
Fax (703) 519-9958